

**MINUTES**  
**TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**May 1, 2007**  
**Aeronautics Building**  
**Lansing, Michigan**

Meeting noticed in accordance with Open Meetings Act, Public Act 267 of 1976.

**Present**

Carmine Palombo, Chairman  
Robert Slattery, Vice-Chairman  
David Bee, Member  
Spencer Nebel, Member  
Howard Heidemann, Member  
Kirk T. Steudle, Member

Steve Warren, Member  
Jerry Richards, Member  
Rob Surber, Member  
Bill McEntee, Member  
Frank E. Kelley, Commission Advisor

**Absent**

Susan Mortel, Member

**Staff Present**

Rick Lilly- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Stacey Schafer- Bureau of Transportation Planning  
Ron Vibbert- Bureau of Transportation Planning

**Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m.

**Approval of March 7, 2007 and April 4, 2007 Minutes - Rick Lilly**

**Mr. Nebel moved for the approval of the March meeting minutes, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.**

**Mr. Nebel moved for the approval of the April meeting minutes, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.**

**Correspondence and Announcements - Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly stated that Mr. Steudle is testifying at the Transportation Senate Committee and will be here as soon as possible to vote on the Annual Report.

Mr. Lilly brought the Council up to date as to where Mr. McNinch is on RoadSoft. He is sending out a questionnaire this week. Once the data is returned to them, we are going

to need to set the committee up that will look at the answers so we can begin to populate the model. Mr. Lilly is going to need the names of some engineers that can go over these answers from the counties, cities, and MDOT. This will be done primarily through email.

An email was received from the city engineer in Bay City. They are requesting an exemption on the training for PASER. This is will be discussed later in the meeting under 2007 Data Collection.

Mr. Lilly indicated that an approval of the changes to the Asset Management Guide is not going to be requested at this meeting. This does need to be discussed in the future. However, there have been some very significant changes by Mr. McNinch.

In regards to the National Conference in New Orleans in November, Mr. Lilly was informed, preliminarily, that the planning committee was very interested in the four year report about the Council and the lessons learned. The planning committee has approved this and it is now up for a vote in front of the full steering committee on Friday. In all likelihood the Council will have a presentation at the National Conference this year.

Mr. Warren, Mr. Steudle, and Mr. Palombo took part in a Webinar that Federal Highway Administration hosted last week. Mr. Warren stated it was a first of many presentations on highway transportation, dealing with the introduction of asset management. Each of them gave a small presentation on asset management as well as what the Council is doing. Michigan was really highlighted in this first series. About 50 participants took part in this from around the country.

Mr. Slattery indicated that he gave a presentation at the County Road Association of Michigan's Blue Water Bridge Conference. It was well received.

Mr. Richards stated that he is scheduled to do a presentation at the National Center for Pavement Preservation. They have put out a book called "At the Cross Roads" which is an excellent primer on asset management, particularly for elected officials and those who want to know more about asset management. John O'Doherty is the primary author/staff member. He is going to be attending the Meridian Township board meeting on May 15<sup>th</sup> and is going to give a presentation about asset management.

**Mr. Palombo arrived at 1:20pm.**

### **Monthly Report – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly sent out the Monthly Report to each of the Council Members. All questions and concerns were addressed.

## **Report on TAMC Annual Conference and Training Session – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly handed out a summary and evaluation of the conference. The Planning Committee held a follow-up meeting. Mr. McNinch did a nice job on this, showing evaluations of each presenter. Mr. Lilly indicated that we had 200 participants, which is down about 30 from last year. 116 participants turned in evaluations. The ratings were better than last year. Some of the comments were that the question and answer session could have been better. Mr. Warren suggested at the next conference we have two different question and answer sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. Mr. Slattery stated that we could pose some questions of our own to start the flow of the session.

Mr. Lilly indicated that one of the comments was that we have one of the MPO/RPO talk about the services that are offered as a help to the agencies. This is something that we need to keep in mind for next year.

The Planning Committee needs to know if the Council wants to have two conferences next year, with one in the Upper Peninsula. Mr. Nebel stated that the attendance would have been better this year, had the meeting not been canceled. A lot of the agencies are small and there is a tendency for a later registration. Mr. Nebel stated that he would like to try the conference in the U.P. next year. Marquette would be the most convenient location in the U.P., one of the most centrally located cities. Houghton is another possibility, along with Escanaba. Mr. Slattery stated that he is in favor of planning another conference in the U.P. Mr. McEntee asked what attendance in the U.P. would have been good. Mr. Lilly stated that the Planning Committee was looking for around 50 participants at the conference. The Planning Committee will plan on two conferences for next year.

Another issue is where would the best location for the Lower Peninsula conference be? Mr. Nebel thought it would be a good idea to move the conference around in order to get more and different participants. Mr. Warren is all in favor of moving the conference around, but noted that the least attended region was the southwest corner of the state. Mr. Palombo indicated that he does not see a problem in moving the conference around. Mr. Richards wondered if there was any way that we could do a survey of the participants to see if the location would have made a difference. Mr. Slattery posed the idea of doing a broadcast of the conference for more participants. We could do something similar to a Webinar. The problem is that this is extremely expensive and there are a lot of logistics that go along with setting this up. This idea can be brought up at the next Planning Committee Meeting.

Mr. Palombo inquired about cost. Mr. Lilly indicated that there is not a final cost yet. There is still money that is outstanding. We took a large deduction from canceling the meeting in Marquette.

The largest group of participants at the conference came from cities. This was the same for the training class. A number of them were finance and administration

participants. We had people from the concrete and asphalt industry as well. Mr. Lilly, Mr. Surber, Mr. McNinch, and Tim Colling were the presenters at this training. Mr. McNinch and his staff did an outstanding job on the restructuring of the class. Participants really enjoyed the class as a whole. There will be two more trainings some time after October. About 1/3 of the participants that attended the training also attended the conference.

Mr. Palombo indicated the Conference Planning Committee did an outstanding job and should be commended for all of their hard work.

### **Discussion on 2007 PASER Data Collection**

Mr. Lilly gave the Council an overview of the PASER Data Collection effort for this coming year. Given the current state budget situation the PASER collection has been temporarily suspended. Per Council instruction, Mr. Lilly put together a memo seeking an exemption from the Governor's Executive Directive which was given to the Director that would allow us to continue data collection. The Director has not responded to this issue as of today's meeting. We are not in bad shape in terms on the data collection, due to the fact that we started early this year. The delay for this month and last month is nothing different then where we have been in years past. Mr. Lilly is not concerned that we are not going to get the data collected. The decision should not be made to start early in the future because we could be putting too much data collection in the current year instead of splitting it up into two fiscal years.

Mr. Lilly stated that because of the budget situation, he is not going to be take on new agencies that request to collect local road condition on their own. Mr. Lilly has only had to turn down 2 or 3 so far. Mr. Slattery inquired about the approval of these agencies. Mr. Lilly there are only 4 or 5 agencies that have actually submitted their data and requested to be reimbursed.

Mr. Lilly stated that the big issue that the Council has to deal with is that if the state continues in the budget situation it is, and we are not exempted, this means that MDOT will not be in the PASER rating car. The question would be does the Council want to continue to collect the PASER data if MDOT is not in the car? This is something that needs to be discussed, especially with the Data Management Committee. Mr. Warren asked if the issue was related to MDOT travel or could this be contracted? Mr. Lilly stated that the executive directives say that MDOT staff can not go to training right now, although most got through the training before the budget crisis. In a lot of instances MDOT vehicles were being used, this might not be available this year. It may be that MDOT can not participate, be trained, or the vehicles can not be used. The Council has to wait for direction from the Director of Transportation. The Council does not need to take any action at this time. The only thing that is on hold is the data collection.

Mr. Palombo wondered if we had communicated this well enough to the local agencies or should we be looking for other ways to get this information out to them. Mr. Lilly stated that we have used the MPO/RPO's in order to get this message out to each

agency. Mr. Palmobo stated that we should remind these agencies that this is an activity the Council is supporting, despite what is happening with the budget. Mr. Nebel wanted to know if there was some sort of communication that we could do in order to get this message out there. Mr. Palombo directed Mr. Lilly to get something out to the MPO's on this issue.

Mr. Palombo stated that relating to the data collection; we are going to have to address the issue of training and getting paid. Mr. Palombo received an email from the Bay City, city engineer regarding his concerns of data collection. What is the Council position on the training situation? Mr. Warren's opinion is that its important for the individuals to be trained at some point, preferably the most up to date. However, if 1 of the 3 had been recently trained we could consider making adjustments for these situations. Mr. Warren would hate to exclude someone if they had not been to the most recent training, this might be a tough position to take. Mr. Lilly stated that this type of situation does not happen very often. Mr. Palombo indicated that this is going to be a constant problem for such communities as Bay City. The city engineer indicated that a winter training would be best for his agency.

Mr. Palombo asked if there was support for Mr. Warren's idea of not having every person in the car mandated to be most up to date training, simply some training in past years. Mr. Nebel asked what the downside to this would be. Mr. Lilly stated that the downside would be that more people would start to ask to be exempted. We may get this anyway because a number of agencies complain on having to go through training every year. It may be that the Council needs to start looking at other options, and how often training should be done for each individual. Mr. Lilly indicated that it was important to have the training each year to go back over how the agencies did and talk about such things as quality control.

Mr. Palombo added that rather than changing Council policy, they could give staff the instruction to handle these situations on a case by case basis. Mr. Heidemann indicated that we need to have a fair policy and it should not be placed as a burden on staff. Mr. Lilly stated that this comes up every year and it would be tough to do just for one year. Mr. Slattery stated that even if we were going to make a change and give staff discretion this would be a change in policy. Mr. Warren brought up the idea of using some sort of technology in which raters could get trained without actually having to be at the training course.

Mr. Palombo indicated that further discussion will take place in July.

### **Cancellation of June Council Meeting – Rick Lilly**

**Mr. Nebel moved for the cancellation of June Council meeting, supported by Mr. Bee. Motion carried.**

The next Council meeting will be held on July 11<sup>th</sup>, at which time the 2009 budget will need to be passed.

### **Approval of changes to Asset Management Guide for Local Road Agencies – Rick Lilly**

Mr. Lilly stated that when this was first done, Mr. McNinch had done a good job in restructuring it. Mr. Lilly stated that the version that he has right now is completely rewritten and is not what was approved last year. It has gone from 9 chapters to 13 chapters and Mr. Lilly is not prepared to ask for Council approval. Mr. Lilly is asking that this be tabled indefinitely. **Mr. Richards moved that the Asset Management Guide for Local Road Agencies be tabled indefinitely, supported by Mr. Nebel. Motion carried.**

### **Approval of 2006 Annual Report – Rick Lilly**

**Mr. Steudle arrived at 2:55 p.m.**

Mr. Lilly sent out a copy of the latest version of the 2006 Annual Report. Mr. Lilly went through the areas that he was directed to change at the April Council Meeting. Comments and concerns were addressed.

**Mr. Richards moved for the approval of the 2006 Annual Report, supported by Mr. Slattery. Motion carried.**

The annual report will go out tomorrow to the State Transportation Commission and the Legislature as required by law.

### **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

---

Frank E. Kelley  
Commission Advisor